

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 324/GT/2014**

Subject : Determination of tariff for National Capital Thermal Power Station Stage- II  
(2 x 490 MW) for the period 1.4.2014 to 31.3.2019.

Date of Hearing : **11.7.2016**

Coram : Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member  
Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member

Petitioner : NTPC Limited

Respondents : UPPCL and 3 others

Parties present : Shri Ajay Dua, NTPC  
Shri Rajeev Choudhary, NTPC  
Shri Pasiyan Siran, NTPC  
Shri Sameer Agarwal, NTPC  
Shri E P Rao, NTPC  
Shri Vivek Kumar, NTPC  
Shri Manish Garg, UPPCL & BYPL  
Shri R. B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL  
Shri Varun Shankar, Advocate, TPDDL  
Shri Sameer Singh, BYPL  
Shri Nishant Grover, BYPL

**Record of Proceedings**

This petition has been filed by the petitioner, NTPC for approval of tariff of National Capital Thermal Power Station Stage-II (980 MW) ('the generating station') for the period 2014-19 in terms of the 2014 Tariff Regulations.

2. During the hearing, the representative of the petitioner made detailed submissions in the matter and prayed that tariff of the generating station may be revised after truing-up, as claimed in the petition. He further submitted that additional information as sought for by the Commission has been filed and copy served on the respondents.

3. The representative of the respondents, UPPCL & BYPL mainly submitted as under:

(i) The claim of the petitioner for additional capitalisation under multiple provisions of the regulations (e.g fire detection alarm system under Regulation 14(2)(ii) and 14(3)(iii), Main plant package, Railway siding, under Regulation 14(1)(ii) with Regulation 54, 14(3)(v), Fire water protection system under Regulation 14(3)(ii), 14(3)(iii) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations) is not appropriate and acceptable. The claim of the petitioner shall be confined to a specific provision of the regulations for consideration by the Commission.

(ii) The replacement of 63 MVAR bus shunt reactor on the recommendations of PGCIL cannot be allowed under Regulation 14(3)(ii) as the same is not a statutory pronouncement falling within the scope of Change in law.



4. The learned counsel for respondent, BRPL adopted the above submissions and further stated as under:

(i) The cut-off date of the generating station was extended till 31.3.2014 and despite this, the petitioner could not complete the deferred works. Thus, the claim of the petitioner invoking 'Power to relax' under Regulation 54 cannot be considered.

(ii) The claim of the petitioner for Fire water & Protection system in terms of the CEA (Technical standards for construction of electrical plants and electrical lines) Regulation, 2010 cannot be allowed, as the said regulations which came in to effect subsequently, is not applicable.

(iii) The claim of the petitioner for expenditure towards Bus sectionalisation can be considered in the tariff of Dadri GPS or Stage-I of this generating station.

(iv) The de-capitalisation of exclusion items is necessary and the same may be reduced from the capital cost as per proviso under Regulation 7(1)(c) of the 2009 Tariff Regulations excluded from the book value of the assets as they are currently not in use.

(v) Reply filed in the matter may be considered.

5. The learned counsel for the respondent, TPDDL adopted the above submissions of the respondents and prayed that the reply filed in the matter may be considered.

6. The representative of the petitioner submitted clarifications on the issues raised by the respondents above.

7. The Commission after hearing the parties reserved its order in the petition.

By order of the Commission

*Sd/-*  
B. Sreekumar  
Dy. Chief (Law)

